

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 27, and 28 were pending and claims 1-12, 27, and 28 stand rejected. By virtue of this response, claims 2 and 6-9 have been cancelled and claims 1, 10, 27, and 28 have been amended. The amendment to the claims is fully supported by the claims as originally presented, e.g., see Figs. 19A-19C and paragraph [0067] of the application as published. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 27, and 28 are currently under consideration. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants' remarks are presented in the same order in which they were raised in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

A. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto et al. (JP 08212749).

Applicants have amended claim 1 herein to include features similar to claim 2 and further to recite that the first and second segments of reduced thickness are laterally offset from each other. In particular, claim 1 is amended to include a second media access aperture provided on the bottom of the housing, wherein the front side of the housing contains a second segment of reduced thickness "adjacent the second media access aperture and offset laterally from the first segment." The amendment is fully supported by the claims as originally presented and shown clearly in Figs. 19A-19C, for example, which illustrate regions of reduced thickness 254 and 266 offset laterally with respect to each other. *See also*, paragraph [0067] of the application as published.

Sakamoto fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 as amended. For instance, Figs. 8A, 8B, 9A, and 9B fail to disclose or suggest first and second segments of reduced thickness adjacent the first and second media access apertures, the first and second segments laterally offset relative to each other. Sakamoto appears to disclose that the segments of reduced thickness are aligned laterally and not offset as shown in Figs. 1, 8A, and 9A thereof (and which are in stark contrast to Figs. 19A-19C of the present application). Therefore, for at least the reason that

Sakamoto fails to disclose structure that meets the recited features of first and second reduced thickness segments where the second segment is offset laterally from the first segment, as recited by claim 1, the rejection must be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 27, and 28.

Claims 6-8 have been cancelled herein rendering the rejection to these claims moot.

B. Claims 10, 11, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meguro. Claims 10, 11, 27, and 28 now depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Meguro for at least the same reasons as claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims must be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 5, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. or Meguro. Claims 5 and 12 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable over Meguro and Sakamoto for at least the same reasons as claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn and these claims allowed. Further, claim 9 has been cancelled herein rendering the rejection to claim 9 moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 495812005000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Electronic Signature /Christopher B. Eide/
Christopher B. Eide

Registration No.: 48,375
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5720